arXiv:cond-mat/0008258v3 [cond-mat.soft] 3 Nov 2000

Implications of $su(2)$ symmetry on the dynamics of population difference in the two-component atomic vapor

A. B. Kuklov[1] and Joseph L. Birman [2]
[1] *Department of Engineering Science and Physics, The College of Staten Island, CUNY, Staten Island, NY 10314*
[2] *Department of Physics, City College, CUNY, New York, NY 10031*

(February 1, 2008)

We present an exact many body solution for the dynamics of the population difference $N_2 - N_1$ induced by an rf-field in the two-component atomic cloud characterized by equal scattering lengths. We show that no intrinsic decoherence occurs for $N_2 - N_1$, provided the exact intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry holds. Decoherence for $N_2 - N_1$ arises when deviations from the symmetry exist either in the scattering lengths or in the confining potentials. We suggest testing the evolution of $N_2 - N_1$ by conducting echo-type experiments.

PACS : 03.75.Fi, 05.30.Jp

Successful achievement of Bose-Einstein condensation in atomic traps [1] stimulated strong interest in the mechanisms of dissipation and decoherence in the confined atomic clouds (see in [2]). Many intriguing questions are associated with the finiteness of the number of bosons N forming the Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) in the trap. It has been realized that the global phase may experience collapses and revivals as long as N is finite [3–7].

The experimental study of the temporal correlations of the relative phase of the two-component ^{87}Rb BEC has been conducted by the JILA group [8] by means of measuring the dynamics of the population difference $N_2 - N_1$ between the components. No decay of the global relative phase has been detected on the time scale of the experiment $\leq$ 100ms. The question was then posed in [8] as to why the phase correlations are so robust despite an apparent fast relaxation of other degrees of freedom such as, e.g., the relative motion of the two condensates.

In the present work, we address the question [8] of the relative phase correlations. We show that if the two-component system obeys the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry, as is almost the case for ^{87}Rb [9], no intrinsic decoherence exists for the operators which are the generators of this symmetry. In particular, the population difference falls into this category. This result is general and does not depend on a particular form of the Hamiltonian. On the contrary, the nature of the decoherence arising due to deviations from the symmetry is not universal, and it depends on details of the Hamiltonian. We discuss how the nature of the decoherence of $N_2 - N_1$ can be tested in the echo-type experiment (see, e.g., in [10]). Specifically, we suggest modifying the JILA experiment [8] by introducing an extra pulse between the two $\pi/2$ pulses employed in [8]. The echo should then be seen by the readout pulse (the last one) at the time $t_e = 2\tau$ where τ is the time delay between the first two pulses. We note that the atomic echo in optical lattices, predicted by one of the present authors [11], has been observed very recently [12] under, however, the conditions when the inter-particle interaction is not important.

We consider the two-component bosonic system with no exchange interaction between the components (no intrinsic inter-conversion between the species). This system can be described by the second quantized Hamiltonian H [13]. We note that this Hamiltonian has been employed for studying the dynamics of $N_2 - N_1$ in ^{87}Rb in the mean field approximation (MF) [14,15]. In what follows we will obtain the class of *exact solutions* of the full many-body quantum mechanical problem in the case of the $su(2)$ symmetry. We represent H [13] as

$$H = H_S + H_A + \epsilon_0 J_z + H_P, \tag{1}$$

$$H_S = \int d\mathbf{x}\{\Psi_1^\dagger H_{1s}\Psi_1 + \Psi_2^\dagger H_{1s}\Psi_2 + \frac{g}{2}(\Psi_1^\dagger\Psi_1 + \Psi_2^\dagger\Psi_2)^2 + \frac{\tilde{g}}{2}(\Psi_1^\dagger\Psi_1 - \Psi_2^\dagger\Psi_2)^2\}, \tag{2}$$

$$H_A = \int d\mathbf{x}\,\{\Psi_1^\dagger H_{1a}\Psi_1 - \Psi_2^\dagger H_{1a}\Psi_2 + \frac{g'}{2}[(\Psi_1^\dagger\Psi_1)^2 - (\Psi_2^\dagger\Psi_2)^2]\}, \tag{3}$$

$$H_P = \frac{\hbar\Omega^*(t)}{2}J_+ + \frac{\hbar\Omega(t)}{2}J_- \; . \tag{4}$$

Here Ψ_i is the second quantized Bose field of the i-the component ($i = 1, 2$); H_S is symmetric and H_A is anti-symmetric with respect to exchanging the components $\Psi_{1,2} \to \Psi_{2,1}$; H_P describes the effect of the rf-field [8,14,15]; $\epsilon_0 = const$ is the detuning of the external field $\hbar\Omega(t)$ (taken in the rotating wave approximation) from resonance between the components; $\Omega(t)$ stands for the corresponding Rabi frequency treated as an envelope of the rf-pulses [8,14]; $H_{1s} = (H_1 + H_2)/2$, $H_{1a} = (H_1 - H_2)/2$; $H_j = -\hbar^2\nabla^2/2m + U_j(\mathbf{x})$ $(j = 1, 2)$, stands for the one-particle part which includes the kinetic energy and the trapping potential; the binary collision terms are taken in the contact form, where

$$g = \frac{\pi\hbar^2}{m}(a_1 + a_2 + 2a_{12}), \quad \tilde{g} = \frac{\pi\hbar^2}{m}(a_1 + a_2 - 2a_{12}), \quad g' = \frac{2\pi\hbar^2}{m}(a_1 - a_2) \tag{5}$$

are related to the corresponding scattering lengths a_1, a_2, a_{12}. We have also introduced the following operators

$$J_z = \frac{1}{2}\int d\mathbf{x}(\Psi_2^\dagger\Psi_2 - \Psi_1^\dagger\Psi_1); \;\; J_+ = \int d\mathbf{x}\Psi_2^\dagger\Psi_1; \;\; J_- = \int d\mathbf{x}\Psi_1^\dagger\Psi_2\,. \tag{6}$$

It is important that the operators (6) represent the $su(2)$ algebra of the angular momentum operators. Indeed, it is easy to see that these operators obey the standard $su(2)$ commutation relations

$$[J_z, J_+] = J_+, \quad [J_z, J_-] = -J_-, \quad [J_+, J_-] = 2J_z, \tag{7}$$

provided the field operators obey the Bose commutation rule $[\Psi_i(\mathbf{x}), \Psi_j^\dagger(\mathbf{x}')] = \delta_{ij}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')$. The operator $J_z = (N_2 - N_1)/2$, with $N_{1,2}$ standing for the total number of bosons in the first and the second components, respectively, can be viewed as the z-component of the angular momentum operator; $J_x = (J_+ + J_-)/2$, $J_y = (J_+ - J_-)/2i$ are the x,y-components, respectively. We note that the formalism of the effective angular momentum operators has been successfully applied in many areas including optics (see, e.g., in Refs. [6,16]).

In the work [9] it has been emphasized that the two component ^{87}Rb realizes the $su(2)$ intrinsic symmetry to a very good approximation due to almost perfectly satisfying the relations $a_1 = a_2 = a_{12}$ as well as $U_1 = U_2$. Thus, $\tilde{g} = g' = 0$ and $H_{1a} = 0$ in Eqs.(5), (2), (3). Then, the part H_A (3) is zero, and in the case $\epsilon_0 = 0$, $H_P = 0$, the total Hamiltonian is just H_S (2) which commutes with all the $su(2)$ operators (6) even though $g \neq 0$. This situation corresponds to an exact $su(2)$ symmetry [9] in the trap [17].

Let us, first, consider the effect of violation of the $su(2)$ symmetry by the external rf-field (no intrinsic violation). So we choose $g' = 0$, $\tilde{g} = 0$, $H_{1a} = 0$ in the Hamiltonian (1)-(4). It is important to emphasize that in this case, the full Hamiltonian (1) forms a closed algebra with the operators (6). Accordingly, the Heisenberg equations for $J_{+,-,z}$ are

$$i\hbar\dot{J}_z = \frac{\hbar\Omega^*(t)}{2}J_+ - \frac{\hbar\Omega(t)}{2}J_-, \quad i\hbar\dot{J}_+ = -\epsilon_0 J_+ + \hbar\Omega(t)J_z, \;\; i\hbar\dot{J}_- = \epsilon_0 J_- - \hbar\Omega^*(t)J_z\,, \tag{8}$$

where the $su(2)$ commutation relations (7) have been employed. We note that these equations are exact and linear in $J_{+,-,z}$. Accordingly, there is no dissipation for these quantities (unless the parameters ϵ_0 and $\Omega(t)$ fluctuate due to external noise).

The above conclusion of the absence of the intrinsic decoherence for the population difference in the case of intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry is the main result of this work. It is important that it is not limited by the specific form of the Hamiltonian (1)-(4). In fact, any form of H where $U_1 = U_2$ and the interaction part can be expressed solely in terms of the total density operator $\hat{\rho} = \Psi_1^\dagger\Psi_1 + \Psi_2^\dagger\Psi_2$ will lead to the same conclusion. This is so because H and $J_{z,\pm}$ form a closed algebra in this general case as well.

Now let us consider particular cases. First, we study the effect of the two short pulses investigated experimentally in Ref. [8]. In the initial state $|t = 0\rangle$, all $N = N_1 + N_2$ bosons occupy only one component (e.g.,$i = 2$), so that $\langle t = 0|J_z|t = 0\rangle = N/2$ [8]. The effect of a short pulse can be described by the unitary transformation $U = \exp(-i\int dt H_P)$ in the sudden approximation (from now on we choose units $\hbar = 1$). Taking into account Eq.(4), we find

$$U = \mathrm{e}^{-i(v'J_x + v''J_y)}, \tag{9}$$

where $v' = \int dt\Omega'(t)$, $v'' = \int dt\Omega''(t)$, with $\Omega'(t)$ and $\Omega''(t)$ being the real and imaginary parts of $\Omega(t)$ in Eq.(4). As a result of the pulse taking place at some time moment t, any operator $\hat{O}(t)$ before the pulse transforms into $U^\dagger\hat{O}(t)U$ after the pulse. Specifically, the operator J_z changes as

$$J_z \to U^\dagger J_z U = \cos v J_z + \frac{\sin v}{v}\left(v'J_y - v''J_x\right)\;, \tag{10}$$

where $v = \sqrt{v'^2 + v''^2}$. This relation is a consequence of (7). Let us choose $v = \sqrt{v'^2 + v''^2} = \pi/2$, which corresponds to the $\pi/2$-pulse [8]. If the first $\pi/2$-pulse was imposed at time $t = 0$, and the $-\pi/2$-pulse was produced at $t > 0$, the state just after the second pulse can be represented as $|t\rangle = U^\dagger\exp(-iHt)U|t = 0\rangle = \exp(-iU^\dagger HUt)|t = 0\rangle$. Then, the population difference $N_2 - N_1 = 2J_z$ after the second pulse is

$$2\langle t|J_z|t\rangle = 2\langle t = 0|\mathrm{e}^{i\epsilon_0 t U^\dagger J_z U}J_z\mathrm{e}^{-i\epsilon_0 t U^\dagger J_z U}|t = 0\rangle = N\cos(\epsilon_0 t)\;. \tag{11}$$

where the explicit form (1)-(4) (for H with $g'=0,\,\tilde g=0,\,H_{1a}=0$) as well as the conditions $\langle t=0|J_{x,y}|t=0\rangle=0$, and Eq.(10) have been employed for $v=\pi/2$. We also took into account that $[J_j,H_S]=0$.

Eq.(11) represents an exact many body solution in the presence of the binary collisions for the case of exact intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry. The collisions, causing dissipation of the normal modes, do not affect the dynamics of the $su(2)$ generators J_j and their observables, as long as the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry holds [18]. As a matter of fact, in the above analysis we never assumed the presence of the Bose-Einstein condensate. Thus, the solution (11) is formally true in the normal phase as well. In some sense, the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry *protects* the population difference from decoherence. This property can be employed in quantum computations [19], where decoherence is usually the main fundamental obstacle.

The goal of the present paper is elucidating the role of the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry rather than discussing all possible mechanisms of the decoherence, which arise due to violation of the symmetry. This will be done in a separate publication. Nevertheless, let us discuss some most obvious sources of the decoherence. First, we comment on the role of instrumental noise which is always present. Referring to the solution (11), the noise may produce fluctuations of ϵ_0. In general, these can be of two types: i) temporal $\epsilon_{ir}(t)$ with some short correlation time τ_{ir} ; ii) ensemble fluctuations ϵ_r from realization to realization (in the destructive measurements [8,14]), so that $\epsilon_r=const$ during each realization. Thus, one can represent $\epsilon_0=\bar\epsilon_0+\epsilon_{ir}(t)+\epsilon_r$, where $\bar\epsilon_0=\langle\epsilon_0\rangle$ stands for the mean over the fluctuations (which are assumed to be gaussian). The type i) produces irreversible decoherence characterized by the exponential decay $\langle t|J_z|t\rangle\sim\exp(-\Gamma t)$, with $\Gamma=\int_0^\infty dt\langle\epsilon_{ir}(t)\epsilon_{ir}(0)\rangle\approx\tau_{ir}\langle\epsilon_{ir}(0)\epsilon_{ir}(0)\rangle$ at $t\gg\tau_{ir}$. The type ii) induces reversible decoherence (dephasing) characterized by the gaussian time dependence $\langle t|J_z|t\rangle\sim\exp(-t^2/\tau_d^2)$ with the dephasing rate $\tau_d^{-1}=\sqrt{\langle\epsilon_r^2\rangle/2}$. The reversible dephasing will dominate the evolution if the condition $\tau_d^{-1}\ll\Gamma^{-1}$ is fulfilled, provided $\tau_d\gg\tau_{ir}$. In other words, the irreversible temporal noise (type i)) is irrelevant if $\sqrt{\langle\epsilon_r^2\rangle}\gg\tau_{ir}\langle\epsilon_{ir}^2(0)\rangle$. Thus, the decay is reversible at times $\tau_d<t<\Gamma^{-1}$. This can be tested by the echo method [10–12]. In order to observe the echo, three pulses are required, so that the first $\pi/2$-pulse takes place at $t=0$, then some extra (time-reversal) pulse is imposed at $t=\tau>0$, and, finally, the readout $\pi/2$-pulse takes place at some time $t>\tau$.

Below we present an exact echo solution in the case of the exact intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry for the case $\tau_d<t<\Gamma^{-1}$. The time-reversal pulse is taken as the $-\pi$-pulse. Then, the state just after the last pulse is $|t\rangle=U\exp(-iH(t-\tau))U^\dagger U^\dagger\exp(-iH\tau)U|t=0\rangle=\exp(-iUHU^\dagger(t-\tau))\exp(-iU^\dagger HU\tau)|t=0\rangle$. We take into account (7), and obtain the population difference $N_2-N_1=2\langle t|J_z|t\rangle$ (for $\tilde g=0,\,g'=0,\,H_{1a}=0$) after the third pulse as

$$N_2-N_1=N\cos(\epsilon_0(t-2\tau))\,. \tag{12}$$

The solution (12) gives a complete revival of the initial population difference at $t=2\tau$. Averaging over the type ii) noise yields

$$N_2-N_1=N\cos(\bar\epsilon_0(t-2\tau))\mathrm{e}^{-(t-2\tau)^2/\tau_d^2}\,. \tag{13}$$

Should the temporal noise (the type i)) be present, the echo (at $t=2\tau$) acquires the suppression factor $\exp(-2\Gamma\tau)$. Thus, the echo can be observed if $2\tau\Gamma\leq 1$.

An intrinsic decoherence of $\langle t|J_z|t\rangle$ occurs when the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry is broken. This may be due to deviations of $\tilde g,\,g'$ and H_{1a} from zero [17]. Accordingly, the terms describing coupling of the operators (6) to the normal modes will enter Eqs.(8). We note that the effect of $H_{1a}\neq 0$ has been studied recently in Ref. [15].

Here, we consider the effect of the shot noise produced by uncertainty in the initial depostion of the total N in the trap. In this analysis we take into account that $\tilde g=0,\,g'\neq 0$ in Eqs.(2),(3) for the case [8]. We also assume that the shot noise is large, so that thermal effects can be neglected, and one can set $T=0$. Furthermore, we consider no asymmetry in the trapping potential ($H_{1a}=0$). At $T=0$ the main contribution to $\langle t|J_z|t\rangle=(N_2-N_1)/2$ comes from such many-body eigenstates where almost all $N_{1,2}$ belong to the corresponding condensate single particle states $\varphi_{01}(\mathbf{x}),\,\varphi_{02}(\mathbf{x})$. In this case, the operators $\Psi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$ can be represented as $\Psi_1=a_1\varphi_{01}(\mathbf{x})$, and $\Psi_2=a_2\varphi_{02}(\mathbf{x})$, where $a_{1,2}$ destroy one boson from the condensate states $\varphi_{01}(\mathbf{x}),\,\varphi_{02}(\mathbf{x})$, respectively. Such an ansatz resembles the two-mode approximation widely used previously (see, e.g., in Ref. [6]). Employing it in Eqs.(1)-(4) and (6) yields the Hamiltonian (1) as

$$H=C+(\epsilon_0+b_1N)J_z+b_2J_z^2+\frac{\Omega^*(t)}{2}J_++\frac{\Omega(t)}{2}J_-, \tag{14}$$

where C commutes with (6), and thereby can be omitted as long as the dynamics of $J_{z,\pm}$ is concerned; the coefficients $b_1,\,b_2$ can be expressed in terms of the original parameters entering Eqs.(1)-(3). In fact, the form (14) is general as long as only the binary collisions are taken into account, and no exchange interaction occurs. It is important that $b_1,\,b_2$ vanish if the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry holds. The effect of the shot noise is described by the term $\sim b_1$.

In this paper we consider the simplest case of the confinement in a box of the volume V, and neglect the phase separation effect [8]. Then, provided $H_{1a}=0$, $\tilde{g}=0$, we find $b_1=-2g'/V$, $b_2=0$ [20] in Eq.(14). Now it can be seen that the role of ϵ_0 is played by $\epsilon_0-2g'N/V$ in the solutions (11), (12), provided $N=const$ during each measurement [8]. We assume that the shot fluctuations are characterized by some known variance ΔN. This yields the dephasing rate

$$\tau_d^{-1}=\frac{\sqrt{2}|g'|\Delta N}{V} \tag{15}$$

in Eq.(13). It is important to emphasize that the shot noise does not disrupt the phase coherence in each realization. Therefore, the echo effect described by Eq.(13) will be observed in this case. It is worth also noting that the trap losses may introduce some effective temporal noise into Eq.(14). It will yield the exponential factor $\sim \exp(-t/\tau_L)$ in Eq.(13), where τ_L is the confinement time. Thus, the trap losses do not disrupt the coherence because in any realistic experiment its duration t should be much shorter than τ_L.

Let us estimate the rate of the dephasing induced by the shot noise. In ^{87}Rb, $|g'|/g=0.03$; the quantity $\mu\approx gN/V$, which is a typical value of the chemical potential, can be taken as $\mu\approx 10^2-10^3\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ ($\hbar=1$) [2]. Thus, $\tau_d^{-1}\approx 0.04\mu\Delta N/N\approx(4-40)\Delta N/N\mathrm{s}^{-1}$. For $\Delta N\approx\sqrt{N}$, we estimate $\tau_d\approx(0.3-3)$s from Eq.(15), where we take $N=10^4$. For $N=10^6$, this estimate increases by the factor of 10. Such long decoherence times should be contrasted with the longest relaxation times $10-50$ms for the normal modes [14]. We note, however, that the effect of the shot noise may be deliberately enhanced by making, e.g., $\Delta N\sim N$. In this case the echo effect can be made much more pronounced. For example, if $\Delta N=0.1N$ for typical number of atoms $N\approx 10^4$ and $\mu\approx 10^3\mathrm{s}^{-1}$, we find $\tau_d\approx 30$ms.

The case of $T\neq 0$ when the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry is slightly broken requires special consideration. This will be presented in a separate work. Here we only give a qualitative reason as to why the *reversible dephasing* should dominate the evolution of N_2-N_1 between the rf-pulses as long as a significant portion of atoms forms the two-component condensate. Indeed, if no external bath is present and $N_{1,2}$ are conserved separately, the dominant evolution of the condensate operators $\Psi_i(\mathbf{x},t)\approx a_i(t)\varphi_{0i}(\mathbf{x})$ in any given exact many-body eigenstate is simply given by the exponents $\exp(-\mu_i t)$, where μ_i is the chemical potential of the ith component in the given eigenstate. A detailed analysis of this has been given in the case of a single component condensate in Ref. [21]. Thus, temperature is simply producing the thermal averaging of the exponent $\exp(i(\mu_1-\mu_2)t)$ over the exact eigenenergies. This produces the gaussian decay determined by the thermal fluctuations of the relative chemical potential $\mu=\mu_1-\mu_2$. In other words, the normal modes of the condensate do not produce irreversible decay of the global phase [22]. This is in close analogy with the case of the single condensate [21]. Thus, the echo effect should persist at $T\neq 0$ as well, if BEC is present [24].

In summary, we have pointed out that the dynamics of the population difference in the two-component atomic vapor is controlled by the closeness to the $su(2)$ internal symmetry. In the case of the exact symmetry, no intrinsic decoherence occurs for the population difference. This result answers the question posed by the JILA experiment [8]. In the presence of the condensate, slight deviations from the intrinsic symmetry result in reversible dephasing of the population difference which can be revealed in the echo experiment. We suggest considering the global relative phase of the two-component condensate, which obeys the intrinsic $su(2)$ symmetry and thereby is protected from the intrinsic decoherence, as a viable candidate to be employed for quantum computations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the authors (A.K.) is grateful to E. A. Cornell for useful discussion of possibilities of observing the echo effect. This work was partially supported by a CUNY Collaborative Grant.

---

[1] M.H. Anderson, et al., Science **269**, 198 (1995); K.B. Davis, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3969 (1995); C.C. Bradley, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett.**75**, 1687 (1995).
[2] F. Dalfovo, et al. Rev.Mod.Phys. **71**, 463 (1999).
[3] F. Sols, Physica B **194-196** 1389 (1994).
[4] E.M. Wright, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2158(1996).

[5] M. Lewenstein and L. You, Phys. Rev. Lett **77**, 3489 (1996).
[6] G.J. Milburn, et al. Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4318 (1997).
[7] J. Javanainen, M. Wilkens, Phys. Rev. Lett **78**, 4675 (1997); A.J. Leggett, F. Sols, Phys. Rev. Lett **81**, 1344 (1998)
[8] D.S. Hall, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett **81**, 1543 (1998).
[9] M.R. Matthews, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett **83**, 3358 (1999).
[10] M. Weissbluth, *Photon-Atom Interactions*, Academic Press, Boston - Toronto, Ch. 3.5, (1988).
[11] A. Bulatov, et al., Phys. Rev. A **57**, 3788 (1998).
[12] F.B. Buchkremer, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett **85**, 3121 (2000).
[13] Tin-Lin Ho, and V. B. Shenoy, Phys. Rev. Lett **77**, 3276 (1996).
[14] D.S. Hall, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett **81**, 1539 (1998).
[15] J. Williams, et al. Phys. Rev. A **61**, 033612 (2000).
[16] B. Yurke, et al. Phys. Rev. A **33**, 4033 (1986).
[17] There are certain deviations from the perfect symmetry in ^{87}Rb. The scattering lengths are in the ratio $a_1 : a_{12} : a_2 = 1.03 : 1 : 0.97 \neq 1$ [14]. Eq.(5), then, yields $g' = 0.03g$ and still $\tilde{g} = 0$. Furthermore, U_1 and U_2 are slightly different.
[18] Most of the local operators $\hat{O}$ which do not commute with H_S should exhibit dissipation induced by the collisions due to the term $\sim g$ in (2).
[19] R. P. Feynman, Int. J. of Theor. Phys. **21**, 467 (1982); G. K. Brennen, et al., Phys. Rev.Lett. **82**, 1060 (1999); J. Ahn, et al., Science **287**, 463 (2000);
[20] Including the effect of $\tilde{g} \neq 0$ as well as of the phase separation results in $b_2 \neq 0$ in Eq.(14). This term is responsible for the quantum phase diffusion effect (for the relative global phase) considered in Ref. [6]. If the variance of N due to the shot noise is much larger than the variance of M [6], the term $\sim b_2$ can safely be ignored.
[21] A.B. Kuklov, J. L. Birman, Accepted for publication, Phys.Rev. A; cond-mat/00072717.
[22] If some infinite external bath contacts a finite condensate, irreversible phase decoherence should take place [23,3,21].
[23] A.Leggett, F.Sols, Foundations of Phys. **21**,353 (1991).
[24] A.B. Kuklov, J.L. Birman, DAMOP Meeting, ABS S4 7, June 14-17, 2000.